

Attendance of the May 21, 2003 GMAC Meeting
(based on sign-in sheet)

Name	Agency
Amore, Al	CHP
Brown, Hon. Arthur C.	City of Buena Park
Caldwell, Don	Union Pacific Railroad
Calix, Robert	LACMTA
Carpenter, Jeff	City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
Cartwright, Kerry	Port of Long Beach
Catz, Sarah	Golden State Gateway Coalition
Cheng, Luke	LACMTA
Dale, Hon. Lawrence E.	City of Barstow
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
DiCamillo, LaDonna	BNSF
Ewenike, Jimmy	LADOT
Escovilla, Liberty	Caltrans Corridor Studies
Fetty, George	George Fetty and Associates
Green, Gary	Caltrans District 8
Guss, Ron	California Trucking Association
Hayes, Jolene	Port of Long Beach
Hicks, Gill	Gill V. Hicks and Associates
Kumar, Vin	Caltrans District 7
LaCasse, Todd	Caltrans HQ
LaFazia, Corinne	California Trucking Association
Lee, Francis	Caltrans Corridor Studies
McQuade, George	LAEDC
McCarthy, James	Caltrans District 7
Mosby, Bill	Caltrans District 8
Neal, Jim	Wilbur Smith Associates
Pearson, Fred	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Randolph, Stan	Caltrans
Rodriguez, Dilara	Caltrans
Smith, Steve	SANBAG
Stringfield, Jo	Caltrans District 8
Trutanich, Marisa	Port of Los Angeles

SCAG Staff

Faranesh, Zahi
Griffin, Mark
Nam, Annie
Wong, Philbert

GOODS MOVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2003

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Art Brown, City of Buena Park, called the meeting to order. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONCENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

3.1.1 Approval of the April 16, 2003 Minutes

Action: Motion to approve the minutes was accepted and seconded with no objections.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Update on the National I-10 Freight Corridor Study

Dilara Rodriguez, Caltrans, presented this item. More than four years ago the I-10 evolved from studying just one type of technology (the automated separated highway), to other modes and solutions that are available and that might be developed out of the study. The study went from the ports of Los- Angeles and Long Beach to the ports of Jacksonville, Florida. Every state took it upon themselves to define what they wanted to study. Each state started identifying what elements to include in the analysis of the feasibility of moving freight along the I-10 corridor.

Since the I-10 connects the Pacific to Atlantic ocean there are influences from the Asian, European, and Gulf of Mexico markets. Freight has the influence to transcend all state boundaries. The study looked at three different time horizons: the short term-2008, and mid and long term-2013 and 2025. For the short term the focus is on urban centers, for example the 710, 60-10 intersection. The mid and long term-2013 and 2025 includes a view of long range policy influences, strategic type of solutions,

and what can be done corridor wide. ITS is one that becomes the connection that goes from near to long term.

Because the I-10 is 2500 miles, connecting different states with different urban needs, there needs to be flexibility. Since there is no one solution the concept of scenarios was developed. Scenarios were looked at that could be fundable, supportable, and that can be implemented. These scenarios are also a function of the economy, trade, policies, local governments, operations, and innovations. All of these factors were put into what to develop as a scenario. In order to understand what needs to be done there was a need to get public input. In California there were two outreach programs; one hosted by the Los Angeles County MTA and the other was hosted by SANBAG. Thirteen public workshops were held along the corridor.

To understand the role of trucks along the I-10 corridor, FHWA's model was used to understand the level of truck flow and where the trucks travel along the I-10.

Another issue was the impact of the goods that are moved on trucks along the corridor. There is a great amount of truck flow from Mexico that end up on the I-10. All the ports along the corridor were also looked at. An analysis of network flows for California was performed and how much freight the I-10 actually carries.

Seven main scenarios were focused on for study. The scenarios included what the impact would be if nothing is done and freeway widening. For ITS there was a study on auto truck separation, also multi-modal rail corridor, multi-modal water way corridor, urban truck by-passes, and truck productivity.

The questions asked were how each of the seven scenarios reduce construction needs, improve speed, reduce delay, address performance, level of service, reliability, safety, and reduce emissions. These were the major factors that were included in the model.

Looking at some statistics, the total economic impact of the I-10 corridor trade in 2000 included 10.43 million jobs freight-related jobs, and earnings of \$339.4 billion.

The first scenario includes understanding what occurs if the only solution is widening. In California there is a need for 10 lanes in each direction on the I-10 just to maintain the current level of service. The cost of doing nothing is 2.40 trillion dollars, meaning the I-10 would lose its importance and competitiveness. Each system needs to improve and function on its

maximum capabilities. Each state should have the flexibility to do the projects that are needed to improve the system.

4.2 SCAG Briefing Papers: Regional Rail Capacity Improvement Program and User-Supported Regional Truckways in Southern California.

Mark Griffin, SCAG, spoke on this item. The Briefing Papers will be used by SCAG to engage county commissions in discussions of the two principal programs that are seen as Goods Movement strategies in the region. For the purposes of GMAC, the papers represent the first effort for drafting what will be the truckway and rail strategy within the Goods Movement element of the 2004 RTP. The two papers present a foundation from which to begin the process of working on the policy discussions.

Several comments were made in regard to the Truck and Rail Briefing papers. For example, on page 4 of the Rail Capacity Improvement Program, the table says Alameda Corridor train forecast is “average daily trains”, which is probably 20% higher than “average daily trains”. Also the first bullet point states that fees would be assessed on containers shipped by rail to and from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. However, the Alameda Corridor East train forecast on page 4 counts all trains coming out of downtown Los Angeles, which includes piggyback, domestic, as well as international shipments.

On page 5, the TEU forecast should be interpolated between 2010 and 2025 so that it does not show a constant number of TEUs.

Because it assumed that all cargo, not just containerized cargo, will be subject to fees, the language in the report should be modified to reflect this.

On page 7 of the Regional Truckway paper, should the toll rate increase, and not decrease? The toll rate shown indicates the amount that needs to be collected in order to offset debt service. As VMT increases, the toll rate decreases.

4.3 Update on Goods Movement Project List

This item was presented by Mark Griffin, SCAG staff. The projects on the Goods Movement list that are captured in the regional priority list are identified. On page 8 there are two projects on the priority list that were not captured in the Goods Movement project list. Therefore, if San

Bernardino or Ventura county would like to sponsor these for inclusion in our list that can be accommodated.

With the model results being completed, the plan is to see that the projects that are supposed to be on the network and modeled are in fact there in our model. Then there will be a report on how the Goods Movement list is developing in the runs for the regional transportation model that are starting to be done in preparation for the RTP.

The update also reflects changes and modifications based on comments received from different committee members. This is a continual process and if amounts, descriptions or characterizations of projects are not fully in sync, please advise staff.

5.0 COMMENT PERIOD

There were no comments.

6.0 NEXT MEETING

The next regular GMAC meeting will be:
Wednesday, June 18, 2003
9:30am-11:00am
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00am.